

**Environmental Monitoring & Reporting
Informational Meeting
April 26, 2007**

The environmental consultants asked several questions during the meeting. For the benefit of all potential bidders, the questions and District responses are provided below.

Question:

Section 7.2 of the *Vegetation Replacement/Restoration Plan* specifies monitoring for a period of five years following out-planting. Is the Environmental Monitor (EM) responsible for monitoring through this five year period?

Response:

The EM will monitor through the construction phase, which will be complete prior to the five year long-term monitoring period for translocated plants. Therefore, a separate environmental services contract may be required to fulfill the remainder of the five year monitoring obligation.

Question:

Is the weed infestation map referred to in the 2nd bullet on page 13 of the RFP the responsibility of the EM?

Response:

Yes.

Question:

The 4th bullet on page 11 of the RFP directs bidders to propose a budget for steelhead relocation services. Is this necessary given the NMFS concurrence letter and the fact that the Project will employ trenchless construction techniques for all stream crossings that maintain flow during construction?

Response:

Trenching activities across waterways will be restricted to low-flow periods of June 15 to November 1, with construction as early as June 1 if channel is dry. Streams with a likelihood of containing flowing water during the low-flow period will be crossed via trenchless methods with structures above water level, or via existing conduits. Therefore, Project construction is not expected to encounter steelhead. However, as an unexpected situation may arise, EM firms should propose seven days of steelhead relocation services as an optional task.

Question:

Should arborist services be included in the EM scope of work?

Response:

No; arborist services will be the responsibility of construction contractors.

Question:

Explain the “tree bounty” concept mentioned in the 6th bullet on page 11 of the RFP.

Response:

Disregard the tree bounty concept as it will not be implemented.

Question:

Page 11, last bullet: Please clarify if post-construction wetland restoration management and maintenance is part of this scope. What level of restoration maintenance is expected to be performed?

Response:

The EM is responsible for monitoring and wetland restoration management and maintenance only through the construction phase. The EM should plan on managing restoration maintenance of all temporary disturbance areas through the construction phase. The District plans to satisfy its compensatory mitigation requirement by funding an off-site restoration project within the Salinas River watershed. The EM will not be expected to manage or maintain the compensatory mitigation site.

Question:

Is the EM responsible for post-construction oak tree monitoring?

Response:

The EM is responsible for oak tree monitoring only through the construction phase.

Question:

Regarding the last sentence on page 11, is there more information available about the “locations with a high potential for discovery of cultural materials”?

Response:

Refer to the following summary prepared by Environmental Science Associates during the Project's design phase.

Cultural

The following cultural resource locations shall be monitored by a qualified professional archaeologist, meeting the Professional Qualifications Standards defined in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines (36 CFR 61).

Gibson and Parsons-Recommended Cultural Resource Monitoring Locations

The Nacimiento Water Project Final EIR (MRS, 2003: mitigation measure CR-6) requires cultural resource monitoring for the following activities: "...all surface alteration and subsurface excavation work including trenching, boring, grading, use of staging areas and access roads, and driving vehicles and equipment within the boundaries of all exposed sensitive cultural resources." Based on a 2003 inventory by Gibson and Parsons, 16 zones were recommended for cultural resource monitoring (Table 2).

TABLE 2
CULTURAL MONITORING LOCATIONS (MRS, 2003: TABLE 5.8.10)

Project Station Location	Natural Feature	Description	Comments	Potential Adverse Impact	Mitigation
106+00 – 113+00	Santa Margarita Formation (Fm)	Fossiliferous sandstone	Near Paleo. Place 1	Potential	CR-6–CR-10
140+00 - 145+00	Young alluvium	Small fan	Tributary	High	CR-6–CR-10
228+00 - 243+00	Young alluvium	Nacimiento River	Floodplain	Moderate	CR-6–CR-10
687+00 - 708+00	Young alluvium	San Marcos Creek	–	Moderate	CR-6–CR-10
1174+00 - 1179+00	Young alluvium	Warm spring fed creek	–	Moderate	CR-6–CR-10
1185+00 - 1215+00	Young terrace	Salinas River	Holo. Terrace	High	CR-6–CR-10
1215+00 - 1361+00	Paso Robles Fm	Not surveyed	Micro Tunnels	Moderate	CR-6–CR-10
1313+00 - 1333+00	Young alluvium	Salinas River	Low terrace	Moderate	CR-6–CR-10
1424+00 - 1499+00	Young alluvium	Salinas River	Holo. terrace	Moderate	CR-6–CR-10
1499+00 - 1547+00	Salinas River	Alluvium & Paso Robles	–	Moderate	CR-6–CR-10

Project Station Location	Natural Feature	Description	Comments	Potential Adverse Impact	Mitigation
1631+00 - 1651+00	Paleo-meander	Fm Young alluvium	Geomorph. Place 8	Moderate	CR-6-CR-10
1817+00 - 1900+00	Salinas River	Alluvium	Happy Valley	Moderate	CR-6-CR-10
1914+00 - 2015+00	Young alluvium	Santa Margarita Ck.	Geomorph. Place 9	Moderate	CR-6-CR-10
2015+00 - 2110+00	Santa Margarita Fm	Sandstone	Geomorph Place 10	High	CR-6-CR-10
2110+00 - 2126+00	Alluvium	Santa Margarita Ck.	Town area	Moderate	CR-6-CR-10
2126+00 - 2182+00	Young alluvium	Santa Margarita Ck.		Moderate	CR-6-CR-10

Source: The list of locations was assembled from geology and geomorphology data (Gibson, 2003). The original stationing also corresponds to the original design period, listed in the FEIR. The numbers above now reflect the updated stationing as of the 90% design phase.

Additional ESA-Recommended Cultural Resource Monitoring Locations

In August 2005 ESA conducted additional cultural resource investigations, in order to prescribe appropriate mitigation strategies for cultural resources that were not previously addressed or recommended for further study by MRS (2003) and Gibson (2003). As a result of these investigations, ESA recommends three additional sites, that are not included in the EIR table above, that should be monitored for cultural resources during construction activities (Table 3) (ESA, 2006). These monitoring locations were related to identified, but sparse and isolated, archaeological material in the field and areas of greater probability for inadvertent discoveries along the project alignment. These areas are represented on aerials in the ESA (2006) report.

**TABLE 3
ADDITIONAL ESA RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING**

Project Station Location	Site Trinomial	Recommendations
175+50	CA-SLO-2215	Conduct Monitoring
248+00	CA-SLO-1180	Conduct Monitoring
386+00	CA-SLO-2210	Conduct Monitoring

* Station numbers are approximate and may change as project proceeds.

Question:

Is the EM responsible for having an industrial hygienist on their team?

Response:

No; this will be the construction contractor's responsibility.

Question:

Are environmental consultants who have worked on the Project in the past eligible to bid on this contract?

Response:

Yes, firms with previous work experience, including Environmental Science Associates, are eligible to bid.

Question:

What monitoring will be required in 2010 as the schedule suggests in the RFP?

Response:

The majority of the construction will be completed by 2009 and only non-environmentally sensitive construction is planned to occur in 2010. Therefore, the EM should not plan for EM services in 2010.

Question:

What are the details on releasing retention of payments? Can retention be released for each task as they are completed?

Response:

The Jacobs subconsultant agreement will be revised to remove the requirements for retention of payments. The provisions in the agreement in Addendum 1 are for a standard Jacobs subconsultant agreement for US Government work. The Jacobs consultant subcontract for this project will not have a payment retention provision.

Question:

What are the DBE goals for the EM contract?

Response:

The project does not have any DBE/MBE/WBE goals.

Question:

How much detail do you expect in the EM cost proposal? Can the cost proposal anticipate escalation of rates in the 2nd and 3rd year?

Response:

EM consultant proposals are encouraged to keep the cost proposal relatively simple for ease of administration during the work. A separate line item allowance for rate escalation is encouraged.